



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/813,670	03/21/2001	Sharon Marie Lee	041-512-L	3627
27201	7590	10/19/2005	EXAMINER	
UNISYS CORPORATION			FREJD, RUSSELL WARREN	
OFFICE OF GENERAL COUNSEL			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
10850 VIA FRONTERA			2128	
M/S 1000				
SAN DIEGO, CA 92127			DATE MAILED: 10/19/2005	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/813,670	LEE ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Russell Frejd	2128

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 July 2005.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1,4,8,10 and 11 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1 and 11 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) 4, 8, and 10 is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) Other: _____.

In re Application of: Lee et al.

Examination of Application #09/813,670

1. Claims 1, 4, 8, 10 and 11 of application 09/813,670, filed on 21-March-2001 are presented for examination. This action is in response to applicant's After Final paper received on 8-July-2005. With this action, the examiner reopens prosecution of this application.

Claim Objections under 37 CFR 1.75(d)(1)

2. Claims 1, 4 and 8 are objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(d)(1), wherein:

2.1 Each of these claims were amended through the incorporation of now-cancelled claims, but the amended limitations of the cancelled claims were not underlined in the amended claims, making it unclear as to the extent of the new limitations. Further confusing the issue, is the presence of some other underlined limitations. The examiner respectfully requests that the amendments to the claims be underlined in a consistent manner.

2.2 In claim 8 [line 11], the phrase "Server Farm said" is understood to mean "Server Farm, said".

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 101

3. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefore, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

In re Application of: Lee et al.

Double Patenting Rejections

3.1 The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.3218 may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

3.2 Claims 1 and 11 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 5 of U.S. Patent Application No. 09/813,667. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the present invention is directed to [claim 11 preamble] a system for deriving a proposed base solution of servers and Server Farms at one or more sites with their supporting apparatus to support a proposed configuration adequate to handle the specific

In re Application of: Lee et al.

requirements of a specific customer's enterprise, and the application is directed to a system for collecting and storing customer profile information on a plurality of database information-holding means and utilizing said information via an algorithmic optimization method for providing an optimum set of configurations for a Server Farm most suitable to a customer-user. Furthermore, the claims noted above of the present invention and the *application* are each directed to:

an adequate proposed configuration (*an optimum set of configurations*);
calculating a base solution (*an algorithmic optimization*);
formatting customer profile data (*customer-client-user profile development*);
storing information in a database (*database information-holding*); and
developing an optimized configuration of Server Farms tailored to a customer's profile
(*developing an optimized Server Farm configuration for a specific customer*).

For at least these reasons, one of ordinary skill would have found it obvious that the present invention and the application are not patentably distinct in so far as the specifications of each application support the identical critical features noted above.

Claim Objections

4. Claims 4, 8 and 10 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims, and resolution of the claim objections noted above.

In re Application of: Lee et al.

Response Guidelines

5. A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire **3 (three) months and 0 (zero) days** from the date of this letter. Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned (see MPEP 710.02, 710.02(b)).

5.1 Any response to the Examiner in regard to this non-final action should be

directed to: Russell Frejd, telephone number (571) 272-3779, Monday-Friday from 0530 to 1400 ET, or the examiner's supervisor, Kamini Shah, telephone number (571) 272-2279. Inquires of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the TC2100 Group Receptionist (571) 272-2100.

mailed to: Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks
P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

or faxed to: (571) 273-8300

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to the Customer Service Window, Randolph Building, 401 Dulany Street, Alexandria, VA, 22314.

Date: 17-October-2005

Russell Frejd

RUSSELL FREJD
PRIMARY EXAMINER